

there was an earthquake. We always rise to the occasion in Congress and go to the aid of places that are affected. Well, now we have a man-made disaster in terms of the economy; and in New York, it is even worse because of the recession on top of the recession when we had the attack on the World Trade Center, which dislocated a major part of our economy. The Federal Government should come to the aid of New York, not only in the same way it comes to all parts of the country with respect to the recession, but we still need help in building back what was taken away as a result of an act of war against the United States.

Osama bin Laden and the terrorists did not attack New York City because it is New York City. They attacked it because it was a target in the United States. It was an act of war against the United States, and we deserve to have more help from the United States Government in the rebuilding of New York, just as we went to the aid of San Francisco and Oakland when they had a super earthquake. Billions of dollars went there. We have gone to the aid of islands who have had floods and natural disasters all over the country. Now is the time to go to the aid of our big cities suffering most from this recession in every way.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE UNITED STATES DELEGATION OF THE CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLE). Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276d, clause 10 of rule 1, and the order of the House of January 8, 2003, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the United States Delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, in addition to Mr. HOUGHTON of New York, chairman, appointed on March 13, 2003:

Mr. OBERSTAR of Minnesota,
Mr. DREIER of California,
Mr. SHAW of Florida,
Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York,
Mr. STEARNS of Florida,
Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota,
Mr. MANZULLO of Illinois,
Mr. SMITH of Michigan,
Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania,
and Mr. SOUDER of Indiana.

MORE HOMELAND HEROES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDI) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. TANCREDI. Mr. Speaker, as I do on several occasions, I attempt to bring to the attention of the body and the people of this country a group of people who I have referred to as homeland heroes. These are people whose efforts in defense of the homeland go unheralded, unfortunately, but who, in

every way imaginable, are living in situations that we can only describe as war-like. They are living on a war front, and I refer specifically to our borders where an invasion is occurring. And these folks, the folks that I refer to as homeland heroes, represent to me, anyway, the sort of first line of defense, and they look to their government to help them defend their country, their lives, their homes. Unfortunately, the Government of the United States looks the other way.

Tonight I wanted to bring to the attention of the body the newest member of this group of homeland heroes. His name is Gary McBride. He is a 59-year-old rancher in Cochise County. He has lived in Arizona all of his life. He manages a ranch of over 22,000 acres in Rucker's Canyon, which is 30 miles off the U.S.-Mexico border just northeast of Douglas.

I met Gary McBride on one of my most recent visits to Arizona, and I visited the Rucker Canyon area on a beautiful Sunday morning. Mr. McBride is a frustrated man, I should tell my colleagues. He cannot understand why his own government cannot curtail the flow of illegal aliens across the rangeland he manages. This is a good question. It was one I could not give him a good answer to.

Mr. McBride is the manager of a ranch with 30 bulls, 300 cows and their offspring. His job is to see to it that the care and feeding of these cattle goes on. Anything that affects the cattle or increases the cost of raising cattle has a direct impact on his life.

A few things are basic to raising cattle and bringing them to market. These things include water, feed, and fences. Let us concentrate on just water for a little bit. Water is, of course, an enormously valuable commodity, as it is in Arizona and throughout the West. I am sure one can understand how wasted water and damaged water lines can be a big headache for ranchers. All of the ranchers I spoke to along the border region have experienced continual problems with their water lines because of illegal alien trespassers.

□ 1800

The illegals stream across their land in very large numbers. Anyone walking many miles across open range will need water. If the trespasser only drank the water and did not damage the water lines, the water troughs, water pumps and other equipment, that would be one thing. It would not impact the ranch so much, and it would not add that much to the cost of raising cattle. Unfortunately, the illegal aliens coming across the land in large numbers do not merely drink water from spigots or troughs. They break a float or fix it so it will not shut off, or they turn a valve so the tank is drained completely dry and the water wasted.

A typical storage tank holds 10,000 gallons of water. In the last year alone these tanks have been drained three times, the tanks owned by Mr.

McBride. This is a lot of water to waste in time of drought. Not only are the cattle affected, but local wildlife is also affected.

Often the generator for the water pump is damaged or vandalized. The cost of replacing a generator, anywhere between \$3,000 and \$5,000. I will stress that these are new situations for people living on the border, for Mr. McBride who has lived there all his life. It is not new to have illegal trespassers coming across their land. It is completely new to have them come across in numbers of hundreds, even thousands. It is also new to have this phenomenon where they are so intent on vandalizing the property. They confront property owners in very aggressive ways.

There is a difference today, they will tell you. Anyone on the border will tell you there is a big difference today in the people coming across the border and the people that used to come across three or four at a time looking for a job, that oftentimes the ranchers would provide, give them some food, send them on their way. But today it is different.

Fences. Let us go into that part of what it takes to be a rancher in this area. A central part of ranch management is having good fences. Keeping fences repaired is a big problem for all of the ranchers on the border region. One or two people crossing the land might easily crawl under or over a cattle fence, but groups of 20 or 50 or 1,000, usually headed by what is called a coyote, and the coyote cares nothing for the fences.

This is not the four-legged animal we are talking about. Coyote is the term used for the individual who is leading the group of illegal immigrants across the country. So as I say, he does not care a thing about your fences. And in order to facilitate the movement of the people quickly, which is what he is trying to accomplish, they will cut the fences or trample them down. On one recent evening, trespassers destroyed five gates and six fences in one 15-mile stretch involving four different property owners. Think about the cost in supplies and time to repair those gates and fences. On another night the trespassers destroyed two gates and two fences that took Mr. McBride \$170 to fix.

When a fence is down, cattle move across and wander into adjacent ranch property. It typically takes over 100 manhours each month to sort the cattle out and move them back where they belong. Sometimes the coyotes create a new problem that never existed before. Mr. McBride told me about this fence that serves no purpose but to stop illegal traffic. Mr. McBride had to build a strong fence on a quarter-mile stretch of road to prevent vehicles from using a back road to transport drugs across his land. It was the only way to stop the almost nightly flow of trucks across his land. It cost him \$1,033.25.

How about the trash, another aspect of this that goes undiscussed and to which very few people pay attention. But if you live in this area and on the land down there, you pay attention to it. It is the pristine environment; pristine except for those areas where illegals have made it a national dump. Cows are not very smart, but they are curious creatures, and they will eat almost anything when hungry. They eat trash bags and plastic. The illegal aliens coming across the rangeland in groups, as I say, in groups of 100 or more, will leave behind lots of trash. They leave milk jugs, plastic bags, baby diapers and other things.

When a cow eats the plastic bag, she will die, but she will not die right away. It will eventually block her digestive system and cause infection. She will either starve to death or die of gangrene from the infection because of the blockage. The cost of each dead cow, lost income, \$750. If a cow is carrying an unborn calf, it is about another \$400. In the last year alone Mr. McBride lost three cows with baby calves. The total cost is \$3,450.

Now we listen to this kind of thing, and you may be thinking to yourself that this is just the cost of doing business, and, after all, we all have these problems. But it mounts up, and the cost of doing business on the border, it is a little more difficult to do business down there because of the environment. It is a very harsh environment, and these are things that are happening that could be prevented. That is the other thing. These are not just part of the natural environment. These are things that are happening to people living on that border every single day, destroying their livelihood, destroying their lives, and forcing them off of their land, and this is what I believe to be intolerable.

Let us talk about another aspect of massive immigration of illegals across their land. Over the past year Mr. McBride put out several small grass fires started by illegal trespassers that left campfires unattended. Luckily, the fires were discovered and put out before they could do much major damage, but last summer only 40 miles west of McBride's ranch, a major fire was caused by illegal aliens in the Coronado National Forest. I happened to have been there at that time, by the way. It was called the Ryan fire. It burned over 38,000 acres. It came right up to the border of the town of Sierra Vista and the U.S. Army facility at Fort Wachuka.

Only 2 days ago there was another fire in the same vicinity of Santa Cruz County, this time in a wildlife preserve. It burned over 450 acres until it was brought under control. Front page story from Tuesday's Tucson newspaper, the Arizona Daily Star, quotes a Forest Service employee as saying the source of the fire was a cooking stove used and abandoned by illegal aliens. Perhaps the Tucson churches that want to provide plentiful water to the aliens

crossing the border could also provide them with a manual for camping safety.

Mr. McBride kept a journal of his encounters with illegal aliens over a 3-month period last year. He spent a lot of time calling the Border Patrol and waiting for them to arrive. McBride encountered illegal aliens on 46 separate occasions over a 90-day period, sometimes as many as 3 encounters in a day. Over the 9-month period, January 1 and September 1, 2002, Mr. McBride made 101 calls to the Border Patrol to come and apprehend illegal aliens. This does not include the numerous times when he did not bother to call the Border Patrol because there was no chance of catching the trespassers, or there were too few involved, and he knew the Border Patrol would not come out anyway.

Some of the encounters are not friendly, and they make daily life hazardous to local residents. Mr. McBride found trespassers in his barn where they leave garbage, feces, and lighted cigarettes. He has been run off his road by illegal drug smugglers traveling at high speeds. In his daily experience drugs are now smuggled across his ranchlands every single day; not occasionally, not weekly, but daily. Equipment has been stolen from his garage. Groups of illegal aliens stand in front of his yard and yell at him, demanding to use his telephone. Real estate values in the area have fallen dramatically as few people want to purchase a ranch and cope with the daily stresses and additional costs imposed by the constant flow of illegal trespassers.

Mr. McBride is a frustrated man because he sees nothing happening about his problem. He has every right to be frustrated. Nothing happening. People apparently here do not care. At least not enough of us care.

Many of us, however, on this floor and in this body share the frustration because we see much more that can be done and could be done to secure our borders and curtail, if not stop, this invasion. For example, we could adopt a policy that the Armed Forces of the United States could conduct routine training exercises along the northern and southern borders. As a Nation, by action of this Congress, we could adopt a policy that one-third of all our military training take place within 50 miles of our borders. That would send a message that we are serious about the borders.

Not long ago, Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity to actually visit a site north of a little town called Bonners Ferry, Utah. It was a site where a group of 100 marines along with the Border Patrol in the area and the Forest Service and the Customs Service were trying to see whether or not they could actually use the military to help control, let us say, 100 miles of border up in that most rugged area of the Northern United States and our border with Canada. It was an enormously successful 2-week exercise. While I was

there, we actually saw and the authorities were able to apprehend four people coming across, as I say, the most rugged area you could imagine, no roads, coming across on ATVs, all-terrain vehicles, carrying 400 pounds of drugs.

Another time a small plane was coming through, and the radar facilities used by the marines, employed by the marines picked it up. It was intercepted. It was also full of narcotics. These would have certainly gone through easily as they had done many times in the past had it not been for the fact that the military was there using military assets, including three drones. These were old, old 1991 model drones, the kind we used in the Gulf War, and they are noisy, but they did the job.

At 2 o'clock in the morning, they picked up those four guys coming across the border, and then they called to the Border Patrol, helicoptered out, intercepted them, and we had them. The really interesting thing is when I talked to the Commandant of that Marine group that was there, he told me that it was the best experience they had ever had. It was the best training experience they had ever had, because it was real time in really rough terrain dealing with real bad guys.

We could be training our military on the border, if nothing else, even if you did not want to put them there all the time because everybody is so sensitive about, oh, my God, what would the Mexicans say, what would the Canadians say about using our troops on our border? Well, I do not really give a fig what they would say.

I could not care less about what Mexico thinks about us trying to protect our own borders, especially when Mexico does everything it possibly can to help people invade the United States. Mexico has departments of government that are designed to help people come into this country, even come in illegally. Mexican Government provides buses, bringing busloads of people to the border of the United States where they dislodge these passengers and let them start walking across into the country, into the desert. This is the Government of Mexico. This is our friend.

This is the country that is represented by President Fox, who came here and said over and over again that he wanted to be our friend. And this is the same country, of course, Mr. Speaker, that refused to be our friend when we asked them for support in the Gulf War, the most recent war in Iraq, in Operation Enduring Freedom. They were not to be found. They were AWOL. They said we should not do it. They would not give us any help. They would not help us defend our country, but they have no qualms about helping their illegals into the United States, because for one thing, of course, those illegals who are here send money back to Mexico and now accounts for a third of the Mexican GDP. It is a huge amount of money. And so Mexico encourages invasion of our country. And

so I am supposed to care about what they think about us putting military on our border? Give me a break.

But let us say we are still sensitive to that, what they might say, what they might do. So do not station them there. Just use them there for training purposes. They get good training. They also help defend the Nation's borders.

At a minimum we could say that all military facilities located in the 14 States along our northern and southern borders must conduct at least half of their training exercises within 50 miles of the border. Utilizing military resources does not mean putting a soldier every 100 feet on the border. That image is conjured up by the opponents of border control. Using our military on the border will not mean a new expenditure of tens of billions of dollars, another myth. But we must be willing to employ our military intelligently, appropriately. And I think we owe it to the citizens of this Nation to do so.

We send our military to borders all around the world. Our military is presently employed defending the borders of Iraq, defending the borders of Afghanistan, defending the borders of South Korea, defending the borders of Kosovo and in the old Yugoslavia. We send them all over the world. We can find the money to send them all over the world to have them defend the borders of other countries. We cannot do it in our own country. Why? Because we are fearful of the reaction not just of the Governments of Mexico and/or Canada, we are fearful of the reaction of people in the United States who have an allegiance greater to other countries than they do to this country. We are fearful that there will be people in this country who are still politically connected to Mexico, for instance, and would raise Cain with us politically for putting troops on the border.

□ 1815

We are fearful that we will lose the votes of this Hispanic, I would say, very small minority, but nonetheless, that is really one of the reasons why we refuse to do it. So let us say what the truth is here. That is why we do not put troops on the border. We are afraid of both foreign and domestic reaction.

I asked Secretary Ridge, I will never forget. It was on this floor. Actually my recollection, it was another Member who asked him during a briefing on this floor. He was then head of the homeland defense, and now, of course, running that new agency; but he was asked why he was opposed to putting troops on the border to defend the country, he is the head of homeland defense after all, and his response was incredibly elucidating. It was very candid, and what he said was the reason why we will not do it is because there are political and cultural obstacles, political and cultural obstacles to putting troops on the border.

I applaud Mr. Ridge for being truthful. He could have given us some

mealy-mouth typical Department of State response to a question like that, but he said it just the way it is. There are political and cultural problems with putting troops on our border.

I will say this, that if we have another event like 9/11 and it happens as a result of somebody coming across these borders illegally, then I want him or any other member of the administration employing this particular philosophy to go to the families of the people who are killed in an event like that and explain that we could not protect them because of the political and cultural obstacles to stop them from doing so. You explain that to them. I certainly will not.

I will tell them that we shirked our duty as a government. We shirked our primary duty. It is to protect and defend the people of this country and their property. We are not doing it for Mr. McBride or any of the people who live along the border in Arizona and Texas, New Mexico, California, any of the other States that are impacted by the invasion to which I have referred. We are not doing it there. We are not helping them, and we are not helping the rest of Americans who are going to be affected by this policy.

To those of my colleagues who think it is just Mr. McBride's problem and just the homeland heroes that I have brought to my colleagues' attention, Mr. Speaker, if they think that is who it is, let me say that it is a much broader category of Americans. It is a much broader spectrum of Americans than just those living on the border who are affected negatively by massive immigration, unchecked immigration, immigration uncontrolled so we do not know who the people are coming into this country.

We have created an oceanful of immigrants, legal and illegal, in which now the most dastardly deeds can be done and people who have come into the country do us great harm, can swim, and they can swim in that ocean undetected simply because there are so many here; and we overwhelm all of our agencies designed to do something about illegal immigration. We overwhelm the INS, the border patrol, the Customs service, homeland defense. We overwhelm them with numbers so it becomes impossible.

Let us look at just one aspect of this. There are, we do not know, but somewhere between 13 and 20 million people living here illegally; but my colleagues say, okay, well, they are not really doing anything, they are not harming the country, they are just providing labor for the jobs necessary to be done that "no one else would do." I hear that all the time, that the only people we are hiring are people taking jobs no other Americans would do.

I tell my colleagues that right there I would challenge that statement and tell them there are millions of Americans looking for work, and they will take jobs and they will take any jobs. I have a fellow working for me who is

a past executive in a high-tech firm. We cannot get him more than a relatively low-level position. It is almost a part-time position. He has a daughter with leukemia. He is looking for insurance benefits. We are able to help provide him that at least. He does data input for us. He also works driving a limousine at night to try to put a roof over his family's head and keep food on the table, and you are telling me there are not American citizens looking for work and that all these illegals are coming in to do work that no American citizen will do? I am telling my colleagues that is blatantly untrue.

There are millions of unemployed Americans looking for jobs that are being done by illegals in this country. Why? For one thing, they are being employed by employers because, of course, they will work for less and they will not make any waves because after all they cannot pay an illegal the same amount of money as they pay somebody else. They cannot give them the same benefits. What they are going to do about it? They are not going to squawk. They are going to be turned into the INS. They are fearful. If they only knew they could get turned into the INS every single day and they are not going to do anything about it. They are leery about it. So they can be manipulated. They can be mistreated, and they often are.

There are plenty of American citizens who need and want jobs; but let us say, all right, out of the 20 million people who may be working here illegally, living in the United States illegally, let us say that 18 to 19 million of them are just regular folks trying to make a living doing the same thing our immigrant grandfathers and grandparents did. Let me tell my colleagues that because there are so many living here illegally and because all of our agencies are swamped by the numbers, we cannot deal with those maybe several hundred thousand, maybe a million people who are living here illegally and are doing very bad things to us.

For instance, a few years ago, we brought pressure, I and other people in this body, against the INS to tell us exactly how many people were actually still living here in the United States, after they had been ordered to be deported. The only way one actually gets ordered to be deported in this country is usually they do something pretty bad and they get arrested and they get arrested for rape or robbery or murder or vandalism, one. All of the sudden they say, oh, by the way, you are also here illegally, you end up in immigration court and the judge orders you deported and you think, oh, good, the INS comes to get them and they take them back. No, wrong, does not happen that way.

They are put out on bond usually, and they are given a letter and says come back, report in 6 months to be deported. Guess what. Just guess. Mr. Speaker, guess what happens. They do not come back, amazing as that is to

contemplate, that someone would actually not come back for their deportation hearing. Well, they do not, of course.

It is called a "run letter." As a matter of fact, when you send them a letter telling them when they are supposed to come, the vernacular is it is a run letter because they run.

Of the people who have been told that they are to be deported because they have committed some crime here, 2 years ago the INS admitted that they had a list of over 320,000 individuals. They would not even talk about it until we forced them to, and actually an immigration law judge called my office and told me about this and said do not use my name, we hear that 1,000 times, do not use my name, I have got to tell you what is happening because I know you get upset about these immigration issues; but he said every day I see in my court, I order somebody to be deported. They put up a bond. They are out the door. We never see them again. He said, I will bet you there are 100,000 or more like that.

We kept pressing the INS. Guess what. There were over 300,000 that they admitted to.

Last year, again because of the pressure, they decided to put these 300,000 people on the NCIC. They decided that we would put them on the databank that was available so that if anybody picked them up crossing the street illegally, running a red light, anything else, and you ran their number in the NCIC, you could get them. We could deport them.

Come to find out, of the 320,000 people that were on that list, according to just statistics that came out the other day, a total of 2,000, little over 2,000, were actually identified over the last year. Of them, about 600 were actually deported, and guess what has happened to that total number. It has grown to about 400,000 people who have been arrested or ordered to be deported and walked out the door.

Now the homeland defense agency is calling upon people to be a little more focused on this issue and calling on local law enforcement agencies to find these people. We have 400,000 people here that the INS admits most of them with felony convictions and who have just walked away. That is one of the problems of having massive numbers of illegal immigrants and even legal immigrants in the country because when it blends together, it becomes impossible for us to track; and, therefore, the resulting consequences to the United States are severe.

There are consequences to massive illegal immigration into this country. We have over 5,000 miles of international border with Mexico and Canada, but Mexicans and Canadians are not the only ones who come across those borders. INS statistics for 2001 show that 70 percent of the illegal aliens crossing from Mexico are Mexican nationals. That means 30 percent are from other countries. The number

of illegal aliens coming into the country by most estimates is three to four times the number that are caught by the border patrol. That means that 1.5 million illegal aliens came into the United States in 2002, and that means that 450,000 came into our country from countries other than Mexico.

In fact, that is the way it is referred to on the border, OTM, other than Mexican. By definition we do not know who these people are or what they are doing here. I ask you to consider just one statistic. If only one percent of those 450,000 people are terrorists, that would mean that there are 4,500 possible terrorists entering our country each year.

The INS said that there are nearly 400,000 absconders. I mentioned that one.

The Haitians, just a little bit ago, big article in the paper about the fact that even the State Department is saying that we have to do something about the people coming in here claiming to be of one nationality but, in fact, they are not, because it detected an increase in third country nationals including Pakistanis and Palestinians attempting to sneak into the United States from Haiti; and because it feared that lax immigration enforcement would lead to a new boat lift from the country, the State Department urged the White House to adopt a policy of detaining illegal aliens arriving by boat from Haiti until they could be deported or granted asylum.

Mr. Ashcroft acceded to the demand, the request of the State Department; and of course The Washington Post and all of the local media went crazy, and this was a racist philosophy and tried to get them to pull back on it. What they worry about, as I say, are so many people coming across claiming in this case to be Haitians, but in fact, they are other nationalities. This is not unique to Haiti.

There is an area of South America, south Central America, South Americans in this case, called the tri-border area. It is Brazil and Argentina and Paraguay, and it is an area in which there is a great deal of activity where illegal aliens are brought in, smuggled in. There is a smuggling ring operating out of Brazil. It brings Middle Easterners into the country, gives them Brazilian documents, keeps them there for maybe up to 6 months, and then moves them forward through Mexico into the U.S.; and if they are stopped, if anything happens, they are identified as Brazilians so there is no big issue. Maybe they will just be deported back to Brazil.

If they were brought here under their true identification as people coming from Middle Eastern countries, most of them on the terrorist watch list, then there would be a lot more attention paid to them. That is why they try to filter them through, try to mask them by coming into the United States as Brazilians.

It is happening with countries all over the world. As we saw just a little

bit ago, the Cuban boats are coming across in large numbers. We have a policy that says if you get to the United States, put one foot on dry land, you will be given asylum. I do not know how carefully we screen these people, but I will tell you that the whole enterprise that we call immigration and immigration control is a farce.

□ 1830

If you get to the United States, you are probably going to remain in the United States. That is the reality of the situation. We deport very few people; that is, if you are sneaking in especially. But if you are trying to get here legally, it can be a very difficult task. I have people coming to my office all the time asking to come into the United States legally, trying to bring a spouse in legally. Very difficult. That is tough. Trying to get somebody here legally could take you years, often does take years. Takes a lot of money. You have to hire lawyers.

I often think to myself that you want to go to these people and say, boy, I hate to tell you this, but it is probably just as easy to sneak in the country, because it is going to take you a long time to do it legally. And if you sneak into the country, you will get all the benefits that anybody gets living here legally. Now, we do not tell them that, of course, and I do not suggest that people do it, but it is hard not to recognize the logic they would employ if they were to look at those two options. Go through all the brain damage of trying to come here legally or simply sneak across the border. Either way you will probably end up in exactly the same sort of circumstance, to live in the United States for as long as you want. That is the problem with immigration policies today.

In just the last week or two, look at all the things that have happened, of course we have seen the horrible tragic situation in Texas, in Victoria, Texas, where 18 migrants died packed into a truck. Oftentimes these trucks carry upwards of 100 people smashed into them. It gets very hot. This is unfortunately not a unique situation, but it is always a terrible, horrendous problem, a horrendous thing to happen, where you have 18 people dead which were being brought in to the country by these coyotes.

I was asked on a television program last night about this, and I was debating someone on that program from an organization that is an open borders-type organization called MALDEV, that is the acronym, MALDEV, and the gentleman was saying that the only way to stop this, according to the open border people, is to allow for greater immigration. But of course it does not matter, as I pointed out to him last night. If we said we will accept another million people a year, or 2 million or 10 million people a year into the United States, as long as we put a cap on it, there will always be people coming in illegally. There will always be this kind of situation.

We have two choices, only two choices. Either we walk away from the borders, close down the border stations, close down the Border Patrol, admit the failure, admit that it is our desire to maintain open borders and allow anybody to come into this country when they want to, go ahead and admit that; and stop the charade, or secure the border. Those are the only two options. There is nothing else. In between leaves us with things like this: 18 dead. It leaves us with hundreds dead in the deserts of the Southwest. People die of exposure. It leaves us with all of the problems that are attendant to having porous borders: The drug trafficking, the horrendous impact on the lives of the people in southern Arizona and all along the borders. These are the things that happen when you have porous borders and you pretend that you have some immigration policy. It is either one or the other. Make a decision, America.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we should try our best in this body to force a debate on whether or not this country wants open borders or whether it wants secure borders. I am a vote for secure borders, needless to say. But if I lose the debate, if I am in the minority, then so be it. We will no longer have people like Kris Eggle being killed in the line of duty.

His parents were here when we passed a bill on this floor, a bill I introduced to name the visitor center at Organ Pipes Cactus National Park down in Arizona, to name the visitors center after Kris Eggle. His parents sat up there in the gallery when we passed the bill here on Wednesday, and his name was added to the list of names that were put on a memorial here in Washington, D.C., for all of the fallen law enforcement personnel of the Nation.

Many of these people like Kris, they are people who were Border Patrol people, they were park rangers, they were Customs officials who were cut down in the line of duty by people coming into this country illegally, people transporting drugs, people protecting those people who were transporting drugs.

Kris Eggle was 28 years old and had a full and rich life ahead of him. I went to his funeral, and I passed a bill to memorialize him. I do not want to have to do anything like that again. There are no parents of children who are employed in our Park Service or on our Border Patrol who want to go through what the Eggles have gone through. Nobody wants to do this again. But it will happen again unless we make that choice that I have just put in front of this Nation. That is it. Either secure our borders or walk away.

This approach we presently employ of having the charade of a Border Patrol, where we put people out on the border, we put them into harm's way, but we really and truly do not mean to secure those borders, this is the worst of all possible worlds. Their blood is on our hands. Those people who make these decisions to keep our borders po-

rous and to put these people in harm's way without supporting them, without a real commitment to defending the border, they have the blood of people like Kris Eggle on their hands.

And so there will be no other way. We will not stop others from dying, not American citizens, not illegal aliens trying to come into the country. It will happen over and over again until we secure those borders. Allow for a legal way for people to come into this country and demand that is the only way they get into this country. Deport everyone who is here illegally.

Now, I know people will go, oh, what are you saying, deport people here illegally? That is exactly what I am saying, Mr. Speaker. We must deport people who are here illegally, and we must prevent those who are trying to come into this country illegally from doing so. That is the only way we can call ourselves a Nation. It does not mean that people cannot immigrate to the United States, as my grandparents and probably yours and everybody else's did. Immigration can still occur. But it can occur on our basis, on how many we want in the country, on what grounds we believe they should be able to come into the country, for how long, what are they going to do here when they get here. But it has to be in a number that we can handle. It has to be a number that we can actually integrate into the country.

There is another whole side of this that we have not even touched upon, and that is the threat to the very culture of the country, the threat to the idea of citizenship that occurs when we have massive immigration coming into the country, and we combine that with this rabid multiculturalism, the cult of multiculturalism that permeates our society and that tells us and tells our students and tells our citizens that there is nothing unique about America; that we have to worship at the altar of multiculturalism; that we cannot be proud of our own culture; that Western civilization is of no value.

It is that philosophy, combined with massive immigration, that could spell doom, and does spell doom for our own country and for our civilization. And, believe me, that is a 1-hour Special Order in and of itself. In fact, we have divided this issue of illegal immigration into different categories. We started off by talking about the danger it poses to our national security.

Then we talked about, in another hour I did, simply the environment, the damage to the environment, the kind of things I talked about earlier, but even in more detail in terms of just exactly what is happening to the environment of this country, what is happening to our parks, to our grasslands, to our deserts when they are crossed by thousands and thousands of people on foot and in vehicles, coming across desert land that is pristine, ruining the lands, depositing all their trash, their feces, their leavings, and leaving it looking like a national dump. The fires.

All of these environmental hazards and all of this environmental degradation that occurs even without the slightest peep from the Sierra Club or any of the other organizations that are supposed to be out there caring for our pristine lands, caring for our environment. They only care to a point. But they are, of course, also wrapped up in the cult of multiculturalism so that they cannot complain about the fact that there is such degradation on our borders and in our parks being committed by people who are coming into the country illegally. That would be seen as a racist comment. That would be seen as someone who is ethnocentric.

Well, race has got nothing to do with this issue. Ethnocentrism has nothing to do with this issue. It is an issue of our national survival, and we are attacked on various fronts.

Then we could spend an hour, and I did spend an hour, talking about just the health care costs, the damage that this massive immigration is doing to our infrastructure in the United States in terms of health care, in terms of tax, the cost to taxpayers to provide housing, to provide roads, to provide hospitals, to provide schools for the massive number of people coming across here into this country illegally.

Twenty-five percent of all people presently incarcerated in Federal prisons are noncitizens. I do not know what it is for cities and localities, but it has to be almost as high, if not higher in some places; huge infrastructure costs to the United States that are not paid for by the "taxes" paid by people coming in here and working, even if they are illegal. I assure my colleagues that the meager amount of taxes paid by people who are employed in low-skill, low-wage jobs in no way pays for the infrastructure costs of their existence here. So there is another aspect of immigration that we do not talk about; that we are afraid to talk about.

Then there is this issue of the culture and the issue of citizenship, the attack on the culture, the attack on citizenship. This is perhaps the most dangerous aspect of the entire phenomenon. It is the desire on the part of a lot of people, maybe even in our own government, to eventually eliminate the distinction between someone who is here as a citizen, a legal citizen, and someone who is here illegally. And everything that is done that provides illegal immigrants with some benefit or other that would usually go to an American citizen is another step towards that elimination of the importance of the distinction of being a citizen.

You can come into this country illegally and get an education for your children. You can come into the country illegally, starting out by breaking our laws just to begin with by placing your foot in this country illegally, and as a reward for that behavior, you can then get your children educated, your children and yourself medical attention, your family provided with all

kinds of benefits in terms of housing, subsidized housing and the myriad of other social services that we provide in this country to the poor.

□ 1845

You can even vote, which in fact they do in large numbers. Illegal aliens are voting in this country in every election. We have had, oh, I do not know how many exposes that have been run showing how many people have been in this country and have voted illegally. They do not have to even do that by lying, sometimes, by lying to the person at the voting booth, by the poll watcher. They can do it by walking into cities right here in Maryland, College Park and others, other cities, that allow people to vote if they are a resident. That is all they ask for, residency, proof of residency. Let me see your utility bill. You do not have to be a citizen. So if you can vote, if you can get Social Security benefits, if you can get social service benefits, if you can have your children educated, if you can have all of that, get your driver's license, send your kids to college and have it paid for by the taxpayers of this country, if you can do all of that, then you tell me, Mr. Speaker, what is the difference between a citizen of this country and a noncitizen? How do we distinguish it? It becomes impossible. That distinction is blurred.

That is the desired goal of many people who are on what I call the open-borders part of this discussion. Some of them are organizations like Maldev, like La Raza. There are many others. You can go on the Web and see these sites. Barrio Warriors. You can see how they talk about taking back the United States, taking back part of the Southwest. You can see what they say about the fact that they have already done it. They will state clearly that they believe that in large measure they have already taken back parts of the United States and that they have not simply come to the United States and become part of our society, our culture and our political system; they have simply moved theirs with them.

There are areas along the Texas border, inside Texas, where there are places called colonias. These are communities that have grown up of illegals, communities often not served by some of the infrastructural services available; they may not have water, but there are thousands and thousands of people living there. And there are places to which law enforcement officials will not go. They are afraid to enter one foot into these colonias because it is so dangerous. So they have a separate community, actually a separate country existing within the United States. They can then claim quite honestly that they have begun to reclaim this country from what they consider to be the outrageous tragedy of Guadalupe Hidalgo, which ceded part of what is now the southwest part of the United States to the United States and took it from Mexico.

These are claims that these people make. I am not making this up. You can go on their Web site and see it. There is a movement they call Aztlan, Return to Aztlan. Aztlan is a term they use to describe that part of the southwestern United States that they believe should be returned to Mexico or made a separate country in and of itself. This all sounds bizarre to most people, but there are many people out there who are committed to this concept. We see the way they talk about Anglos. If you want to use the word "racist" to describe somebody in this debate, it could certainly be used to describe the people who push this kind of separatist agenda.

We are making it more difficult to integrate into society and on the other hand making it very easy for people who choose not to integrate into our society. This certainly can be, and I think will be, a major threat to our existence.

A recent survey was sent out by the Republican National Congressional Committee. We all get these surveys; the Democratic National Committee does exactly the same thing. They send you out a questionnaire. They say, what do you think are the big issues or what do you think about these big issues? Send this back. They usually ask, send it back with a check. It was interesting because Phyllis Schlafly, the head of Eagle Forum, got one of these questionnaires. She writes in a column that was picked up by the Copley News Service. She says, "Whoever produced the survey must have the same world view as inside-the-Beltway policy wonks whose sensitivity to public opinion is bounded by The Washington Post in the morning and Dan Rather in the evening. They are clueless about what grassroots America thinks. Out of the 54 detailed questions sorted into 13 different issues, there was only one about border security and immigration. The lone question appears at the bottom of the page titled Foreign Affairs. There is a section on homeland security but it contains no mention of border security or immigration. I'm going to help the Republican Congressional Committee by providing a list of 20 questions for which the answers would be helpful to party leaders."

I would suggest to the party, both parties, if they are going to send out questionnaires, they should ask some of the questions Mrs. Schlafly puts forward here.

Number one. Do you favor President Bush's plan to give amnesty to undocumented aliens, putting people who violate our laws in line ahead of those who lawfully apply for entry? What do you think the answer to that would be?

Do you favor the repeal of Senator KENNEDY's diversity visa lottery which admits 50,000 aliens per year, mostly from non-Western countries, including countries that sponsor terrorism? What do you think the answer to that would be? How do you think that would come back from most Americans?

Should the U.S. State Department stop issuing visas in countries that sponsor terrorism? Oh, gee, let me think about that one for a while, Phyllis. How should I answer that one?

Do you favor closing our borders to undocumented aliens, illegal drugs, and contagious diseases by whatever means necessary, including electronic fences and National Guard troops? Mr. Speaker, I will include this article in its entirety for the RECORD.

The text of the article is as follows:

GOP SURVEY AVOIDS IMMIGRATION

(By Phyllis Schlafly)

The National Republican Congressional Committee has mailed a survey to a selected list of grass-roots Republicans seeking opinions on "issues of greatest concern" so that the party can be strengthened "by getting more Americans involved."

Of course, it is really a fund-raiser (send your "most generous contribution"), but it is artfully designed to look like authentic market research using catchphrases such as "registered survey number," "classified document" and "data entry control number for office use only."

Whoever produced the survey must have the same worldview as Inside-the-Beltway policy wonks whose sensitivity to public opinion is bounded by the Washington Post in the morning and Dan Rather in the evening. They are clueless about what grass-roots Americans think. Out of 54 detailed questions sorted into 13 different issues, there is only one about border security and immigration. That lone question appears at the bottom of the page titled Foreign Affairs. There is a section on homeland security, but it contains no mention of border security or immigration. I'm going to help the Republican Congressional Committee by providing a list of 20 questions for which the answers would be helpful to party leaders.

1. Do you favor President George W. Bush's plan to give amnesty to undocumented aliens, putting people who violate our laws in line ahead of those who lawfully apply for entry?

2. Do you favor the repeal of Massachusetts Democratic Sen. Edward M. Kennedy's Diversity Visa Lottery, which admits 50,000 aliens per year, mostly from non-Western countries, including countries that sponsor terrorism?

3. Should the U.S. State Department stop issuing visas in countries that sponsor terrorism?

4. Do you favor closing our borders to undocumented aliens, illegal drugs and contagious diseases by whatever means necessary, including electronic fences and National Guard troops?

5. Do you favor requiring visual inspection of the contents of at least 50 percent of trucks entering the United States from Mexico and Canada, instead of the current 1 percent to 2 percent?

6. Do you favor prohibiting the State Department from negotiating a plan with Mexico to give Social Security benefits to undocumented aliens?

7. Do you favor repealing the federal requirement that hospitals must give free medical care, including scarce organ transplants, to undocumented aliens, an unfunded mandate that is bankrupting many hospitals and increasing the price of medical care to U.S. citizens?

8. Do you favor cutting off federal funding to state universities that give lower in-state tuition to undocumented aliens in violation of current federal law, or that refuse to cooperate with the foreign student tracking system?

9. Will you vote to revoke the citizenship of naturalized citizens who betray their oath of U.S. citizenship by claiming dual citizenship with their native country?

10. Do you favor stopping the issuance of driver's licenses to undocumented aliens since many of the 9/11 hijackers boarded the fatal planes by showing their driver's licenses?

11. Do you favor penalties for local public officials who refuse to cooperate with immigration officials in identifying undocumented aliens?

12. Do you favor prohibiting government agencies from accepting foreign-issued identity cards, such as Mexico's matricula consular, as acceptable identification?

13. Do you favor strict health screening of foreigners entering the United States in order to stop the extraordinary rise in cases of tuberculosis, malaria, hepatitis B, intestinal parasites, Chagas' disease, West Nile virus and SARS?

14. Do you favor stopping the racket of smuggling pregnant aliens into the United States so they can give birth to their babies in the United States, thereby making their children immediately eligible for citizenship and welfare?

15. Do you favor a timeout on immigration and visas until the U.S. Department of Homeland Security has a functioning computer system to track aliens, not U.S. citizens, through smart identification cards?

16. Do you favor rescinding Bill Clinton's Executive Order 13166 requiring anyone who receives federal funds, such as doctors and hospitals, to provide their services in foreign languages?

17. Do you favor abolishing federal requirements to provide foreign-language ballots, since the ability to speak, read and write basic English is a requirement to become a naturalized U.S. citizen and only citizens are eligible to vote?

18. Do you favor a general policy of drawing a bright line of difference between U.S. citizens and aliens so that law-abiding U.S. citizens are not treated like potential terrorists or hijackers?

19. Do you favor a Republican Party policy of rejecting political contributions from individuals and corporations that hire undocumented aliens?

20. Is the reason why questions about border security and immigration were omitted from the Republican survey because our leaders don't want to know the answers?

These questions are answered every day in my office. We receive literally hundreds of e-mails and letters, calls into my office with the answers to these questions. In case anybody wonders, let me tell you clearly that a vast majority of Americans believe that we should secure our borders. A vast majority of Americans believe that we should crack down on illegal immigration. A vast number believe that we should reduce even legal immigration. A vast number believe that we should employ whatever we need to employ to secure those borders, including the use of the military.

Most Americans want it. Most Americans understand those categories that I said that this immigration debate breaks down into. Most of them believe that there is a problem in each one of those areas and it has to be addressed through talking about and dealing with our immigration policy, dealing forcefully with it. The only reluctance to do so is in this body and also in the White

House. That is the only place where we are fearful of doing something that, I think I can say without any equivocation, a majority of people in this country want us to do.

Never have I seen an issue, Mr. Speaker, that separates the American people from their government like this one does. Never have I seen an issue the feeling about which is so deep on the part of the people and so shallow on the part of their government. It has gotten to the point where there are places along the border where people have taken up their own defense and armed themselves. I do not encourage that, Mr. Speaker, but I understand the frustration that leads to it. If you are fearful of your children getting to school without being harmed; you are fearful about your wife, her safety and her home on your ranch while you are gone; if you are fearful about people coming through and destroying your way of life, destroying your corrals, your barns; and if you cannot get anyone to answer your call, if you cannot get this government to respond to you, what would you do? I wonder, Mr. Speaker. What would any of us do? Can we really blame people who say if you will not protect me, I will have to try and protect myself.

I want this government to protect them. I want this government to do what we were elected to do. And I will guarantee you, Mr. Speaker, that there are millions of people who are here as immigrants themselves, relatively new, millions of Hispanic Americans who support this effort. They came here usually the right way. They came here legally. They are legal residents of this country, whether it was their grandparents or whomever, just like I am, just like anybody else. They look at the inequity that exists when it is so easy to come here illegally and so difficult to come legally. They recognize that it is a slap in the face to everybody who has come into this country legally and to the millions who are waiting to come into the country legally to allow people to wander across your border and then give them all of the benefits of citizenship.

They know it is a bad policy. They will support us in our efforts. We should not be afraid; we should not be politically frightened because the loudest voices in that community suggest that they will not vote for us if we try to enforce our own laws on the border. Even if they are right, even if we do not get the votes, it should not be what determines whether or not we enforce our own law. Or if we have gotten to the point where that sentiment is the majority sentiment in this country, then let us admit to it. Let us abandon the borders. Bring back those people who are in harm's way. Take them out of harm's way. Let people come into the country at their will. The hundreds of millions who wish to come into the United States, let them do so. Abandon this charade. Or defend the border. Those are the only two choices we have.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BROWN of Ohio) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MEEK of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EDWARDS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SANDLIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FROST, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TURNER of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LAMPSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HINOJOSA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BELL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STENHOLM, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. REYES, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ORTIZ, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KIRK) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HAYWORTH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCCOTTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KIRK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. BIGGERT, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 195. An act to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to bring underground storage tanks into compliance with subtitle I of that Act, to promote cleanup of leaking underground storage tanks, to provide sufficient resources for such compliance and cleanup, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

S. 709. An act to award a congressional gold medal to Prime Minister Tony Blair; to the Committee on Financial Services.